REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, and 7-137 are pending in this case, Claims 7-9, 12-24, 26, 28-31, 33-40, 70-104, 115-128, and 132-137 having been previously withdrawn, and Claims 1, 41-44, 47, 49, 51-53, 55-58, 61, 63, 65, 66, 68, 105, and 129 having been amended by the present Amendment. Amended Claims 1, 41-44, 47, 49, 51-53, 55-58, 61, 63, 65, 66, 68, 105, and 129 are supported by original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed.[1] No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 41-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite; Claims 1-4, 10, 25, 32, 41-46, 48-51, and 53-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Dray, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0184485, hereinafter "Dray"). Claims 129-130 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Miyazaki et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0044780; hereinafter "Miyazaki"); Claims 5, 47, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Dray; Claims 11 and 55-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Dray in view of Raman (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,794); Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Dray in view of Wagner (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0006562); Claim 131 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Miyazaki; and Claims 105-112, and 114 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Miyazaki in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,202; hereinafter "Anderson"); and Claim 113 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Miyazaki in view of Anderson and further in view of Hidalgo et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0051142; hereinafter "Hidalgo").

---

[1] See page 33, lines 9-20, page 300, line 10 to page 301, line 6, and page 111, line 15 to page 112, line 16 of the specification.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Wang for the

discussion with Applicants' representative on January 24, 2008, during which time the 35

U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection was discussed. The Examiner indicated that Claims

25, 106, 108, 129, and 131 were mistakenly listed as rejected, and only Claims 41-69 are

currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112.

In response to the rejection of Claim 25, 41-69, 106, 108, 129, and 131 under 35

U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants respectfully submit that one example of the term

"feature amount" is illustrated in the specification at pages 132-133:

> In the subsequent step S203, a feature amount of the operating
> program file 22 produced in step S202 is computed. The
> function of feature computation means is performed in step
> S203. One example of achieving the feature amount of the
> operating program file 22 is an electronic fingerprint applied to
> the operating program file 22. SHA1 (Secure-Hash-Algorithm)
> is used as a computation method of such a feature amount.
> SHA1 compresses a data block of an arbitrary length
> corresponding to the operating program by a 20-byte sequence.
> Although, similar to actual fingerprints, the feature amounts of
> two different operating programs are expected to be always
> different from each other, it is possible that the same feature
> amount is computed for different operating programs since the
> kinds of values of the feature amount are finite. However,
> since the feature amount can be converted into an extremely
> large number such as 2,160 kinds, a probability that the same
> feature amount is derived from different operating program can
> be ignored probabilistically.

Thus, the above section describes that the feature amount is data used to prevent the

tampering of a file or data by the calculation of a characteristic signature dependent for

example on a size of the file. In addition, Applicants have further amended the claims to

provide better clarity. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the term feature

amount is not indefinite, and Applicants request the rejection of Claims 25, 41-69, 106, 108,

129, and 131 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a), Applicants

respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 recites novel features clearly not

taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an encapsulated document structure

including, *inter alia*:

> ... an operating program file storing an operating
> program that materializes the document information, a
> limitation being given to the operating program by a security
> function when the operating program is interpreted and
> executed by a computer,

> wherein the document information file and the
> operating program file are encapsulated as a single document,
> and

> wherein said operating program is initiated by canceling
> the limitation of the security function by an external start
> program.

Independent Claims 55, 65, 105, and 129 recite similar features as Claim 1 and thus

the arguments presented below with respect to Claim 1 are also applicable to independent

Claims 55, 65, 105, and 129.

Page 6 of the outstanding Office action states that paragraph [0082] of Dray describes

a "limitation being given to the operating program by a security function when the operating

program is interpreted and executed by a computer." However, Dray fails to disclose or

suggest that an "operating program is initiated by canceling the limitation of the security

function by an external start program," as recited in Applicants' Claim 1.

Dray describes that when executing ciphertext, which is limited by being encrypted,

the cipher management program (CMP) 72 decrypts the ciphertext into plain text and uses the

plain text.[2] In other words, in Dray, the limitation to embedded contents is cancelled by the

embedded CMP 72. In contrast, in Applicants' Claim 1, the limitation to the embedded

---

[2] See Dray at paragraphs [0081]-[0083] and [0105]-[0115].

contents is not cancelled, but rather the limitation to the operating program is cancelled before execution of the operating program.

As mentioned above, Dray cancels the limitation to the embedded contents by the embedded program, while in Applicants' Claim 1, the limitation to the embedded program that is to display the embedded contents is cancelled by an external program. Thus, in Dray, the object to be cancelled (limitation to the contents) is different from Applicants' Claim 1 (limitation to the program). Further, in Dray the mechanism which cancels the limitation (an embedded CMP) is also different from Applicants' Claim 1 (an external start program). Lastly, the purpose of Dray is flexible contents distribution, whereas the purpose of Applicants' invention is to enable the safe execution of a program.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 55, 65, 105, and 129 (and all claims depending therefrom) patentably define over Dray.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Miyazaki, Wagner, Anderson, Raman, and Hidalgo fail to cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Dray.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Ronald A. Rudder
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
DPB/rac

I:\ATTY\DPB\24's\246897US\246897US-AM2.DOC